EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.

1750 K Street NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20006

Kenneth R. Boley boley@l-olaw.com Tel 202/887-6230 Fax 202/887-6231

VIA HAND DELIVERY

RECEIVED

March 19, 2003

,

MAR 1 9 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ME SECRETARY

Marlene Dortch Secretary

Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
TW A 225

TW-A325

EX PARTE

445 12th Street, S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of Written *Ex Parte* Presentation

CC Docket Nos. 02-33, 98-10. 95-20, 01-337

Dear Ms Dortch:

On March 18, 2003, the attached letter was delivered to Carol Mattey, Jane Jackson, Brent Olsen, Cathy Carpino, Terri Natoli, William Kehoe, and Michael Carowitz, all of the Wireline Competition Bureau, as well as Harry Wingo of the Office of General Counsel. The purpose of the letter is to rebut a point made by SBC in its March 6, 2003 *ex parte* presentation to these members of the FCC staff.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's Rules, eight copies of this Notice are being provided to you for inclusion in the public record in the above-captioned proceedings. Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Kenneth R. Boley

Counsel for EarthLink, Inc.

CC: Michael Carowitz

Cathy Carpino

Jane Jackson

William Kehoe

Carol Mattey

Terri Natoli

Brent Olsen

Harry Wingo

Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.

1750 K Street NW Suite 600 Washington. DC 20006

Kenneth R. Boley boley@l-olaw.com RECEIVED

Tel 202/887-6230 Fax 202/887-6231

MAR 1 9 2003

March 19, 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Carol Mattey
Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Written *Ex Parte* Presentation

CC Docket Nos. 02-33. 98-10, 95-20: 01-337

Dear Ms. Mattey:

On March 6, 2003, representatives of SBC made an oral *ex parte* presentation to you and other FCC staff in which they argued that the wholesale DSL service SBC provides to Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") should no longer be subject to Title II of the Communications Act. On behalf of EarthLink, Inc. ("EarthLink"), we write to rebut one specific argument in SBC's presentation. EarthLink has addressed SBC's other points in earlier filings in this proceeding.

On page three of its presentation, SBC draws a distinction between ISPs and Application Service Providers ("ASPs"), suggesting that as long as consumers have unfettered access to ASPs, consumer welfare does not require that there be more than one ISP per broadband platform. SBC states, "Consumer welfare issues are independent of whether multiple ISPs are serving end-users over the same broadband platform."

EarthLink has long argued that if the Cornmission determines that wholesale DSL transmission provided to unaffiliated ISPs is not a telecommunications service and is not regulated under Title II of the Act, then ILECs would discriminate against independent ISPs in favor of their own affiliated ISPs, thus putting independent ISPs at a severe competitive disadvantage. The result would be that only one ISP—the one affiliated with the ILEC—would be able to provide DSL-based Internet access services to consumers, and the elimination of ISP choices would harm consumer welfare.'

_

¹ Letter from Jeffry Brueggeman to Marlene H. Dortch, "Notice of Ex Parte," at 3 (March 7, 2003) ("SBC ex parte").

² See, e.g. Comments of EarthLink, Inc., CC Dkts. 02-33, 98-10, 95-20, at 16-22 (May 3, 2002); Reply Comments of EarthLink, Inc., CC Dkts. 02-33, 98-10, 95-20, at 20-22 (July 1, 2002) (footnote continued on next page)

Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.

EarthLink, Inc. *Ex Parte* Presentation CC Dkt. No.s 02-33, 98-10, 95-20; 01-337 March 19, 2003 Page 2

By arguing that consumer welfare is independent of whether multiple ISPs are serving end-users over the same broadband platform, SBC addresses the possibility that if it were freed of Title II access requirements today, it would discriminate against competing ISPs in the provision of DSL. SBC even recognizes that vibrant competition among ISPs offers consumer "benefits," but maintains that "[m]andatory ISP access is not necessary to provide consumer benefits of ISP or ASP diversity." In other words, it is SBC's view that American consumers in its region would be well enough off with only one ISP—the SBC-affiliate—offering DSL-based Internet access service. SBC further suggests that even if the FCC *did* consider such a development to be a "market failure," there is currently "[n]o evidence of market failure necessitating intervention," and that even in the event of such a failure, the "[c]osts of regulation would outweigh benefits to consumers."

EarthLink urges the Commission to reject SBC's approach. Contrary to SBC's presentation, *current* regulation prohibits SBC from discriminating in the provision of wholesale DSL transmission service. It would not be appropriate for the Commission to change that regulation, triggering "market failure" borne of an absence of broadband competition. **As** EarthLink has stated before, those arguing for deregulation of wholesale DSL have failed to describe with any specificity how, as SBC puts it, the "[c]osts of regulation ... outweigh benefits to consumers."

At the core of SBC's theory is the unsupportable contention that ISP diversity is of only marginal consumer benefit. When consumers go shopping for Internet access, they are confronted with a wide variety of options from competing ISPs, and they select the package that best meets their particular needs. First and foremost, there are price differences. Variations in the level of customer service also distinguish ISPs, as do policies for the protection of consumers' privacy, and portability features. Prospectively, independent ISPs will continue to innovate and present new, useful, and desirable features to distinguish themselves in the marketplace, including offerings that may conflict with an ILEC's established interests and thus would be certain not to emanate from an ILEC-affiliated ISP. In fact, independent ISPs were early adopters of DSL-based high-speed data services over copper loops ILECs made available for alarm service, and when it became apparent that DSL threatened to cut into ILECs' T1 business, some ILECs

(footnote continued from previous page)

^{(&}quot;EarthLink Reply"), Comments of EarthLink, Inc., CC Dkts. 98-10, 95-20, at *5-6* (April 16, 2001)

³ SBC exparfe at 3

⁴ <u>Id</u>

⁵ EarthLink Reply at 11-17

⁶ SBC *exparte* at 3

Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.

EarthLink, Inc. *Ex Parte* Presentation CC Dkt. No.s 02-33, 98-10, 95-20; 01-337 March *19*, 2003 Page 3

attempted to withdraw the alarm loop offerings.' It is true that some ISPs, EarthLink included, offer content, but ISPs offer much, much more than content or simple connections *to* the Internet. And the more broadband ISPs there are competing for retail subscribers, the greater those choices will be, to the great benefit of consumers. SBC's approach would sacrifice these benefits, requiring consumers in its territory to accept the price, customer service, and other details of its affiliated ISP service, if they want DSL service at all. Notably, on page seven of its presentation, SBC fails to include in its cost-benefit analysis of DSL deregulation the loss to consumer welfare of decreased participation in the retail broadband ISP market.'

Over the upcoming months, we hope to be in touch with you further on this and other issues raised in this Wireline Broadband proceeding. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to call with any questions or comments. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

In accordance with the Commission's *exparte* rules, an original and eight copies of this letter have been provided to the Commission Secretary for inclusion in the above-referenced dockets.

Mark J. O'Con, r Kenneth R. Boley Counsel to EarthLink, Inc.

cc: Michael Carowitz
Cathy Carpino
Jane Jackson
William Kehoe

Terri Natoli Brent Olsen Hany Wingo

Attachment

-

⁷ See Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge Ken F. Kirkpatrick Permanently Suspending Tariff Sheets Filed Under Advice Letter No. 2663, Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, Docket No. 97K-342T (January 9, 1998) (noting that local area data service ("LADS") oops were being used for DSL, and rejecting U.S. West's petition to discontinue LADS service because, there was no reasonable substitute capable of the same functions, including U.S. West T1 lines which were priced significantly higher than LADS) (foundat, www.panix.com/oppendahl/lads/r9816.sht).

⁸ SBC exparte at 7.